

Weak pseudo-Hermiticity and antilinear commutant*

L. Solombrino

Dipartimento di Fisica dell'Università di Lecce
and INFN, Sezione di Lecce, I-73100 Lecce, Italy[†]

February 1, 2008

Abstract

We inquire into some properties of diagonalizable pseudo-Hermitian operators, showing that their definition can be relaxed and that the pseudo-Hermiticity property is strictly connected with the existence of an antilinear symmetry. This result is then illustrated by considering the particular case of the complex Morse potential.

PACS Numbers:11.30.Er, 03.65.Ca, 03.65.Fd .

*Supported in part by PRIN 2000 "Sintesi".

[†]e-mail: luigi.solombrino@le.infn.it

1 Introduction

In the last years the study of some non-Hermitian Hamiltonians with a real spectrum, and the conjecture on the connection between the reality of the spectrum and the PT-invariance of these Hamiltonians due to Bender and Boettcher¹, have given rise to a growing interest in the literature². Indeed, the above-mentioned Hamiltonians form a subclass of the class of “pseudo-Hermitian” operators, *i.e.*, those operators which satisfy the equation

$$A^\dagger = \eta A \eta^{-1} \quad (1)$$

with

$$\eta = \eta^\dagger. \quad (2)$$

Pseudo-Hermitian operators were introduced in the early 40’s by Dirac³ and Pauli⁴ in order to overcome some divergence difficulties in physics by using an indefinite metric associated with η , and were later resumed by Lee and Wick⁵ (who firstly, at the best of our knowledge, used the term “pseudo-Hermiticity”). More recently, many interesting properties of such operators have been examined and their spectrum has been suitably characterized.^{6,7}

We aim in the present paper to point out further properties of pseudo-Hermitian operators that are relevant from a physical viewpoint. To this end, we introduce in Sect. II the possibly broader class of *weakly* pseudo-Hermitian operators, *i.e.*, those operators which satisfy Eq. (1) without any constraint on the (linear, invertible) operator η , and show that, whenever one considers only diagonalizable operators, this class actually coincides with the class of all the pseudo-Hermitian operators. Hence the condition in Eq. (2) can be dropped when defining (diagonalizable) pseudo-Hermitian operators, which is useful from several viewpoints (in particular, it simplifies checking Eq. (1)). Moreover, we show in Sect. III that a diagonalizable operator H is (weakly) pseudo-Hermitian if and only if an antilinear involutory operator exists which commutes with it. This result has a number of relevant consequences; in particular, in every theory which admits a time-reversal invariance, or a CPT-invariance, the Hamiltonian must necessarily be a (weakly) pseudo-Hermitian operator. Furthermore, the above result is strictly intertwined with an old theorem⁸ of group representation theory, according to which a set of operators admits an involutory antilinear mapping that commutes with it if and only if all the operators in the set can assume conjointly a real form in a suitable basis. Indeed, by using this theorem together with the above results, we conclude in Sect. IV that for any diagonalizable (weakly) pseudo-Hermitian operator H a basis exists in which H has a real form. If this basis coincides with the eigenbasis of H , then H also has a real spectrum. Finally, we illustrate our results by means of an example, considering the special case of the complex Morse potential⁹ in Sect. V.

2 The spectra of weakly pseudo-Hermitian operators

As we wrote in the Introduction, we introduce here a new class of operators, whose properties will be studied in the following.

Definition 1. *A linear operator A is said to be weakly pseudo-Hermitian if a linear, invertible operator η exists such that*

$$\eta A \eta^{-1} = A^\dagger. \quad (1)$$

The above definition generalizes the definition of pseudo-Hermitian operators since we do not assume $\eta = \eta^\dagger$ as is required in the standard definition of pseudo-Hermitian operators^{5,6}.

As in Refs. 6 and 7, we consider here only diagonalizable operators; moreover, for the sake of simplicity, we consider only discrete spectra (see however Sect. V, where a potential with a continuous spectrum is explicitly studied). Whenever H is a diagonalizable operator with a discrete spectrum, a complete biorthonormal eigenbasis $\{|\psi_n, a\rangle, |\phi_n, a\rangle\}$ exists¹¹, *i.e.*, a basis such that

$$H |\psi_n, a\rangle = E_n |\psi_n, a\rangle, \quad H^\dagger |\phi_n, a\rangle = E_n^* |\phi_n, a\rangle \quad (3)$$

$$\langle \phi_m, b | \psi_n, a \rangle = \delta_{mn} \delta_{ab} \quad (4)$$

$$\sum_n \sum_{a=1}^{d_n} |\phi_n, a\rangle \langle \psi_n, a| = \sum_n \sum_{a=1}^{d_n} |\psi_n, a\rangle \langle \phi_n, a| = \mathbf{1} \quad (5)$$

where d_n denotes the degeneracy of E_n , and a and b are degeneracy labels.

The operator H can then be written in the form

$$H = \sum_n \sum_{a=1}^{d_n} |\psi_n, a\rangle E_n \langle \phi_n, a|.$$

For the sake of brevity we also write the above basis $\{|\psi_m\rangle, |\phi_m\rangle\}$ in the following, with an obvious meaning of symbols. Then H can also be written in the form

$$H = \sum_m |\psi_m\rangle E_m \langle \phi_m|$$

(where it may occur that $E_m = E_{m'}$ even if $m \neq m'$). Furthermore, if $\{u_m\}$ is any complete, orthonormal basis in our space, we put in the following

$$O = \sum_m |\psi_m\rangle \langle u_m| \quad (6)$$

By using Eq. (6), we get

$$O^{-1} = \sum_m |u_m\rangle \langle \phi_m|$$

and

$$O^{-1}HO = \sum_m |u_m\rangle \langle \phi_m| \sum_{m'} |\psi_{m'}\rangle E_{m'} \langle \phi_{m'}| \sum_{m''} |\psi_{m''}\rangle \langle u_{m''}| = \sum_m |u_m\rangle E_m \langle u_m|.$$

Moreover,

$$(OO^\dagger)H^\dagger(OO^\dagger)^{-1} = \sum_m |\psi_m\rangle E_m^* \langle \phi_m|. \quad (7)$$

We can now state the following proposition, which embodies some results in Ref. 6 on pseudo-Hermitian operators.

Proposition 1. *Let H be a diagonalizable operator with a discrete spectrum. Then, the following conditions are equivalent:*

- i) H is weakly pseudo-Hermitian;*
- ii) the eigenvalues of H occur in complex conjugate pairs, and for each pair the multiplicities of both the eigenvalues are the same;*
- iii) H is pseudo-Hermitian.*

Proof. The implication *iii) $\Rightarrow$ ii)* is proven in Prop. 7 of Ref. 6. By observing that only the invertibility of η is used in this proof, in order to show that η^{-1} maps the eigensubspace of $H^\dagger$ associated with E_n to that of H associated with E_n^* , and both the subspaces have the same dimension, one immediately transforms this proof into a proof of the implication *i) $\Rightarrow$ ii)*.

The implication *ii) $\Rightarrow$ iii)* is also proven in Ref. 6. We provide here, however, a somewhat different proof of it, which produces a useful decomposition of η (see Eq. (11)).

Let us therefore assume that condition *ii)* holds, and use (whenever it is necessary) the subscript ‘ $_0$ ’ to denote real eigenvalues and the corresponding eigenvectors, and the subscript ‘ $_+$ ’ to denote the complex eigenvalues with positive or negative imaginary part, respectively, and the corresponding eigenvectors.

Then, let us consider the involutory operator T , defined as follows:

$$T|\psi_{n_\pm}, a\rangle = |\psi_{n_\mp}, a\rangle \quad (\text{hence, } T|\psi_{n_0}, a\rangle = |\psi_{n_0}, a\rangle). \quad (8)$$

The explicit form of T is

$$\begin{aligned} T = & T\left(\sum_{n_0} \sum_{a=1}^{d_{n_0}} |\psi_{n_0}, a\rangle \langle \phi_{n_0}, a| + \sum_{n_+} \sum_{a=1}^{d_{n_+}} |\psi_{n_+}, a\rangle \langle \phi_{n_+}, a| + \sum_{n_-} \sum_{a=1}^{d_{n_-}} |\psi_{n_-}, a\rangle \langle \phi_{n_-}, a|\right) = \\ & \sum_{n_0, a} |\psi_{n_0}, a\rangle \langle \phi_{n_0}, a| + \sum_{n_+, n_-, a} (|\psi_{n_-}, a\rangle \langle \phi_{n_+}, a| + |\psi_{n_+}, a\rangle \langle \phi_{n_-}, a|). \end{aligned}$$

The action of T on the bras $\langle \phi_{n_{\pm}}, a |$ easily follows from the expression above:

$$\langle \phi_{n_{\pm}}, a | T = \langle \phi_{n_{\mp}}, a | \quad (\text{hence, } \langle \phi_{n_0}, a | T = \langle \phi_{n_0}, a |). \quad (9)$$

Then, by simple calculations, one has

$$THT = \sum_m |\psi_m\rangle E_m^* \langle \phi_m|, \quad (10)$$

and finally, comparing Eqs. (7) and (10), it follows

$$THT = (OO^\dagger)H^\dagger(OO^\dagger)^{-1},$$

hence condition *iii*) follows at once, with

$$\eta = (OO^\dagger)^{-1}T = \sum_{n_0, a} |\phi_{n_0}, a\rangle \langle \phi_{n_0}, a| + \sum_{n_+, n_-, a} (|\phi_{n_+}, a\rangle \langle \phi_{n_-}, a| + |\phi_{n_-}, a\rangle \langle \phi_{n_+}, a|) = \eta^\dagger. \quad (11)$$

Finally, the proof of the Proposition can be completed by observing that the implication *iii*) $\Rightarrow$ *i*) is obvious. ■

The introduction of the operator T on the above proof and the decomposition $\eta = (OO^\dagger)^{-1}T$ in Eq. (11) allows one to obtain immediately the characterization of the case of real spectrum. Indeed, noting that $T = \mathbf{1}$ if and only if the spectrum of H is real, the following statement holds (see also the Theorem in Ref. 7).

Proposition 2. *The spectrum of a diagonalizable weakly pseudo-Hermitian (hence, of a diagonalizable pseudo-Hermitian) operator H is real if and only if an operator η exists such that $\eta = (OO^\dagger)^{-1}$.*

Furthermore, the existence of an Hermitian operator η whenever H is weakly pseudo-Hermitian implies that also in this case one can introduce an Hermitian, indefinite inner product^{4–6,10} which is invariant under the time translation generated by H .

3 Weakly pseudo-Hermitian operators and antilinear symmetries

In order to discuss properly the next argument, we state the following definition.

Definition 2⁵. *Given the biorthonormal basis $\mathfrak{E} = \{|\psi_m\rangle, |\phi_m\rangle\}$ in a Hilbert space, we call conjugation associated with it the involutory antilinear operator*

$$\Theta_{\mathfrak{E}} = \sum_m |\psi_m\rangle K \langle \phi_m|, \quad (12)$$

where the operator K acts transforming each complex number on the right into its complex conjugate.

Let us discuss now the connection between the (weak) pseudo-Hermiticity condition and the *antilinear commutant*⁸ of H (*i.e.*, the set of the antilinear, invertible operators which commute with it). This connection was already acknowledged in Ref. 7, where the author shows that, if H commutes with an antilinear operator A , then condition *ii*) of Proposition 1 holds, and that a Hamiltonian with an antilinear symmetry A has a real spectrum if and only if the symmetry is *exact*⁷ (*i.e.*, its eigenvectors are invariant under the action of A). The latter statement can be rephrased, using Definition 2, by saying that *the spectrum of H is real if and only if $[H, \Theta_{\mathfrak{E}}] = 0$* .

However, the above results enlighten only partially the key role of the antilinear commutant of H . Indeed, the following, more complete proposition holds.

Proposition 3. *Let H be a diagonalizable operator with a discrete spectrum. Then, the following conditions are equivalent:*

- i) an antilinear, invertible operator Ω exists such that $[H, \Omega] = 0$;*
- ii) H is (weakly) pseudo-Hermitian;*
- iii) an antilinear, involutory operator $\hat{\Omega}$ exists such that $[H, \hat{\Omega}] = 0$.*

Proof. *i) $\Rightarrow$ ii).* Let Ω exist. Then, the linear operator

$$\eta = (OO^\dagger)^{-1}\Theta_{\mathfrak{E}}\Omega$$

(where $\mathfrak{E}$ is the biorthonormal basis associated with H , and O and $\Theta_{\mathfrak{E}}$ are defined as in Eqs. (6) and (12), respectively) fulfils the condition stated by Eq. (1), hence H is (weakly) pseudo-Hermitian. Indeed,

$$\Theta_{\mathfrak{E}}H\Theta_{\mathfrak{E}}^{-1} = \Theta_{\mathfrak{E}}H\Theta_{\mathfrak{E}} = \sum_m |\psi_m\rangle E_m^* \langle \phi_m|, \quad (13)$$

so that, recalling Eq. (7),

$$\eta H \eta^{-1} = (OO^\dagger)^{-1}\Theta_{\mathfrak{E}}\Omega H \Omega^{-1}\Theta_{\mathfrak{E}}(OO^\dagger) = (OO^\dagger)^{-1}\Theta_{\mathfrak{E}}H\Theta_{\mathfrak{E}}(OO^\dagger) = H^\dagger.$$

ii) $\Rightarrow$ iii). If H is (weakly) pseudo-Hermitian, the eigenvalues of H occur in complex conjugate pairs, and for each pair the multiplicities of both the eigenvalues are the same (Proposition 1). Then, one easily sees, recalling the definition of the operator T provided in the proof of Proposition 1 and Eq. (10), that

$$\Theta_{\mathfrak{E}}H\Theta_{\mathfrak{E}} = THT.$$

Hence the antilinear operator

$$\hat{\Omega} = \Theta_{\mathfrak{E}}T = \sum_{n_0, a} |\psi_{n_0, a}\rangle K \langle \phi_{n_0, a}| + \sum_{n_+, n_-, a} (|\psi_{n_+, a}\rangle K \langle \phi_{n_-, a}| + |\psi_{n_-, a}\rangle K \langle \phi_{n_+, a}|) \quad (14)$$

commutes with H . Finally, $\hat{\Omega}$ is involutory, (*i. e.*, $\hat{\Omega}^2 = \mathbf{1}$) as one can immediately verify by using the explicit expression of $\hat{\Omega}$ in Eq. (14).

iii) $\Rightarrow$ *i*). Obvious. ■

Proposition 3 has an interesting physical interpretation, as we have emphasized in the Introduction. Indeed, whenever H is the Hamiltonian of some physical system, it establishes a link between the properties of H (and of its spectrum) and the symmetries of the physical system described by it. For, the time-reversal symmetry is associated, in complex quantum mechanics, with an antilinear operator. Hence, whenever a physical system admits such a symmetry (or else, more generally, it is invariant under the combined action of the time-reversal operator times a linear one) the antilinear commutant of its Hamiltonian must be non-void, hence H is a (weakly) pseudo-Hermitian operator. Vice versa any (weakly) pseudo-Hermitian Hamiltonian admits an antilinear (involutory) symmetry.

Finally, since in the case of real spectrum the operator T defined in the proof of Proposition 1 is such that $T = \mathbf{1}$, hence $\hat{\Omega} = \Theta_{\mathbf{e}}$, one obtains the following proposition.

Proposition 4. *A diagonalizable, weakly pseudo-Hermitian operator H has a real spectrum if and only if it commutes with the conjugation associated with its eigenbasis.*

Remark . While we were writing the final version of this paper, some similar results have been obtained by other authors¹² (in particular, having in mind the equivalence *i*) $\Leftrightarrow$ *iii*) in our Proposition 1, Theorem 2 of Ref. 12 essentially states the equivalence *i*) $\Leftrightarrow$ *ii*) of our Proposition 3). Nevertheless, our presentation is rather different and embodies the new condition *iii*) in Proposition 3, which has a number of interesting consequences, that we are going to explore in the next section.

4 Real form of the (weakly) pseudo-Hermitian operators

According to Proposition 3, for any (weakly) pseudo-Hermitian operator H , at least one involutory antilinear operator exists which commutes with it. Then, it has been proven elsewhere⁸ that any involutory antilinear operator $\hat{\Omega}$ is a conjugation in some suitable basis; moreover, in the basis associated with $\hat{\Omega}$, any operator commuting with $\hat{\Omega}$ has a real form.

The proof of this latter statement can be sketched as follows. If we denote by S the linear part of $\hat{\Omega}$, *i.e.*, $\hat{\Omega} = SK$ (where K is the complex conjugation operator, see Sect. III), then $\hat{\Omega}^2 = \mathbf{1}$ implies $SS^* = \mathbf{1}$ and this is possible if and only if an U exists such that $S = UU^{*-1}$. Then $[H, \hat{\Omega}] = 0$ implies $HUU^{*-1} = UU^{*-1}H^*$, hence

$$U^{-1}HU = (U^{*-1}H^*U^*) = (U^{-1}HU)^*.$$

Referring to the notation introduced in the present paper, let $\mathfrak{F} = \{|v_m\rangle, |w_m\rangle\}$ be the biorthonormal basis associated, in the above sense, to the conjugation $\hat{\Omega}$ which commutes with H (of course, it may be an orthonormal basis which

occurs if and only if, for all m , $|v_m\rangle = |w_m\rangle$), and let us consider the matrix elements of H in such basis. It is easy to verify that they are real; indeed, on one hand,

$$\langle w_i | H | v_k \rangle = \langle w_i | \sum_n |\psi_n\rangle E_n \langle \phi_n | v_k \rangle$$

and, on the other hand

$$\langle w_i | \hat{\Omega} H \hat{\Omega} | v_k \rangle = \langle w_i | \sum_m |v_m\rangle K \langle w_m | \sum_n |\psi_n\rangle E_n \langle \phi_n | \sum_{m'} |v_{m'}\rangle K \langle w_{m'} | v_k \rangle =$$

$$\sum_{m,m',n} \delta_{im} K \langle w_m | \psi_n \rangle E_n \langle \phi_n | v_{m'} \rangle K \delta_{m',k} =$$

$$\langle v_k | \sum_n |\phi_n\rangle E_n^* \langle \psi_n | w_i \rangle = \left(\langle w_i | \sum_n |\psi_n\rangle E_n \langle \phi_n | v_k \rangle \right)^*.$$

Since, trivially, every operator which assumes a real form in some basis $\mathfrak{B}$ commutes with the conjugation associated with $\mathfrak{B}$, we have thus proven the following proposition.

Proposition 5. *An operator H is (weakly) pseudo-Hermitian if and only if a basis exists in which it assumes a real form.*

The results in Propositions 1, 3 and 5 can be collected together, obtaining a set of six equivalent conditions which can be useful in order to characterize the Hamiltonians that we are considering. In particular, the statement in Proposition 5 can be used to write a (weakly) pseudo-Hermitian operator in a more manageable form (an example of basis transformation which puts a particular Hamiltonian in real form is in the next Section).

5 An example: the complex Morse potential

Let us verify the results obtained in the previous sections in the special case of the complex Morse potential⁹. This was extensively studied, for instance, in Ref. 9 and its spectrum was predicted to be real by means of group theoretic techniques¹³.

The Morse potential is given by

$$V(x) = (A + iB)^2 e^{-2x} - (A + iB)(2C + 1)e^{-x} \quad (A, B, C \in \mathbf{R}). \quad (15)$$

Putting $\rho = \sqrt{A^2 + B^2}$, $\theta = \arctan \frac{B}{A}$, $k = 2C + 1$, we get

$$V(x) = \rho^2 e^{-2x+i\theta} - k\rho e^{-x+i\theta/2}. \quad (16)$$

Following Ref. 9, let us introduce the (Hermitian) operator $e^{-\theta p}$ ($\theta \in \mathbf{R}$, $p = -i\frac{d}{dx}$). Hence, we obtain the following Equation⁹

$$e^{-\theta p}V(x)e^{\theta p} = V(x + i\theta) = V^*(x). \quad (17)$$

This equation shows that V is a pseudo-Hermitian (but non PT-symmetric) operator. Let us put now $\hat{\Omega} = SK = e^{\theta p}K$. By using Eq. (17) one gets

$$\hat{\Omega}V = V\hat{\Omega},$$

which agrees with Proposition 3. Then, a straightforward calculation shows that $S^* = e^{-\theta p} = S^{-1}$, hence $\hat{\Omega}$ is involutory, which also agrees with Proposition 3. Moreover, one gets by inspection that

$$S = e^{\theta p/2}(e^{\theta p/2})^{*-1} = UU^{*-1}.$$

Thus, finally,

$$U^{-1}VU = e^{-\theta p/2}Ve^{\theta p/2} = V(x + i\theta/2) = \rho^2e^{-2x} - k\rho e^{-x} = (U^{-1}VU)^*$$

which agrees with Proposition 5.

References

- ¹ C. M. Bender and S. Boettcher, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **80** (1998) 5243.
- ² See, for instance, M. Znojil, "Should PT symmetric quantum mechanics be interpreted as nonlinear?", arXiv: quant-ph/0103054 (2001), and references therein.
- ³ P. A. M. Dirac, *Proc. Roy. Soc.* **A180** (1942) 1.
- ⁴ W. Pauli, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **15** (1943) 175.
- ⁵ T. D. Lee and G. C. Wick, *Nucl. Phys.* **B9** (1969) 209.
- ⁶ A. Mostafazadeh, *Journ. Math. Phys.* **43** (2002) 205.
- ⁷ A. Mostafazadeh, "Pseudo-Hermiticity versus PT-Symmetry II", arXiv: math-ph/0110016 (2001).
- ⁸ R. Ascoli, C. Garola, L. Solombrino and G. C. Teppati, "Real versus complex representations and linear-antilinear commutant", in *Enz/Mehra (eds.), Physical Reality and Mathematical Description* (D. Reidel Publishing Company, Dordrecht-Holland, 1974), 239.
- ⁹ Z. Ahmed, "Pseudo-Hermiticity of Hamiltonians under imaginary shift of the coordinate: real spectrum of complex potentials", arXiv: quant-ph/0108016 (2001).
- ¹⁰ G. S. Japaridze, "Space of state vectors in PT symmetrized quantum mechanics", arXiv: quant-ph/0104077 (2001).
- ¹¹ F. H. M. Faisal and J. V. Moloney, *J. Phys. B: At. Mol. Phys.* **14** (1981) 3603.
- ¹² A. Mostafazadeh, "Pseudo-Hermiticity versus PT-Symmetry III", arXiv: math-ph/0203005 (2002).
- ¹³ B. Bagchi and C. Quesne, *Phys. Lett. A* **273** (2000) 285.